REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **6 July 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-27. Claims 1, 3-5, 9-10, 12-14, 18-19, 21-23, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gerard et al (USPN 6,442,753, hereinafter "Gerard"). Claims 2, 6-8, 11, 15-17, 20, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerard in view of Li (USPN 5,787,275, hereinafter "Li").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by Gerard. The Examiner avers that "Gerard's disclosure implies that the dependency information are shared among other platform-independent machines." Applicant respectfully points out that Gerard teaches using **virtual addressing mechanisms** (see Gerard, col. 5, lines 54-65). As is well-known in the computer arts, virtual addressing mechanisms allow programs executing on a computer system to behave as if they have access to a large, single storage entity, instead of multiple, smaller storage entities. It is also well known in the computer arts that these virtual addressing mechanisms **do not** allow programs executing on a computer system to **share data**.

The present invention creates a list of dependent classes for a target class on a first platform-independent machine, which can be **shared with a second platform-independent machine** (see FIG. 1 and paragraphs [0027]-[0030] of the instant application). Note also that the platform-independent machine can execute on a different computer (see paragraph [0030] of the instant application. This is beneficial because it eliminates duplication of work between cooperating platform-independent virtual machines by eliminating the need for the second platform-independent machine to generate the list of dependent classes. There is nothing within Gerard, either explicit or implicit, which suggests creating a list of

dependent classes for a target class on a first platform-independent machine, which can be shared with a second platform-independent machine.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-9, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-18, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20-27, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By ~~Edward J. Grundler~~
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 18 July 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665